

MINUTES – APRIL 16, 2012

The Caswell County Board of Commissioners met in regular session at the Historic Courthouse in Yanceyville, North Carolina at 6:30 p.m. on Monday, April 16, 2012. Members present: Nathaniel Hall, Chairman, Cathy W. Lucas, Vice-Chair, William E. Carter, Jeremiah Jefferies, Gordon G. Satterfield, Kenneth D. Travis and N. Kent Williamson. Also present: Kevin B. Howard, County Manager, Brian Ferrell, County Attorney, and Angela Evans representing The Caswell Messenger. Paula P. Seamster, Clerk to the Board, recorded the minutes.

MOMENT OF SILENT PRAYER

Chairman Hall opened the meeting with a Moment of Silent Prayer.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Hall asked the Board of Commissioners and the citizens present to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Commissioner Jefferies moved, seconded by Commissioner Travis to approve the agenda. The motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

Commissioner Travis moved, seconded by Commissioner Jefferies to approve the Consent Agenda.

Commissioner Lucas asked “On Page 38 of 183 what are the specifics on the Capital Fund Purchases?” Ms. Gwen Vaughn responded “Originally that was the County Building Fund which was moved out of the different departments as approved rather than moving them from the Capital Fund. These were all approved by you.” Commissioner Lucas continued “Has the money been expended for the ambulance?” Ms. Vaughn responded “Yes ma’am.”

Commissioner Lucas asked “Also under EMS: transfer funds to cover part time salaries?” Mr. Howard responded “That was to finish out the fiscal year. A lot of that is due to not having enough full time staff to fill open positions so we moved money from full time salaries and benefits to cover part time salaries.” Commissioner Lucas continued “How many vacancies are at EMS now?” Mr. Howard responded “I think there are 2.” Commissioner Lucas asked “So Item 6 is just a duplication of Item 4, is that correct?” Mr. Howard responded “Yes ma’am. One shows it leaving from one side and the other shows in coming in.” Commissioner Lucas continued “I think it would be helpful to me, I don’t know about the other commissioners, if you could list what those expenses are that you are transferring or tracking.” Mr. Howard responded “We can provide you with a list of that.” Commissioner Lucas added “It would be helpful in the agenda to have that so we would know specifically what is being transferred and what is not.” Ms. Gwynn responded “I can provide that information.”

Upon a vote of the motion, the motion carried unanimously.

The following items were included on the Consent Agenda:

- A) Approval of Minutes of April 2, 2012 Regular Meeting
- B) Budget Amendment #8

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Chairman Hall opened the floor for public comments.

With no public comments Chairman Hall declared Public Comments to be closed.

2012-2013 Medical Plan Renewal

Ms. Michelle Love stated “Good evening Commissioners, my name is Michelle Love. Mark was here in January and gave you options on the PPO for the next fiscal year. Since then we have received more claims data. In January there was over \$193,000 in claims for the month. The claims are on the increase. In January when we were here we were estimating the claims to remain flat. Our recommendation now is to not add the option for the HSA. Hopefully next year this will be an option if the claims stay flat. This year we will not have a flat renewal. Again our recommendation is to stay with the PPO as it is and not give the option for the HSA.”

Commissioner Satterfield asked “C/m/ee/mth what does that stand for?” Mr. Howard responded “That is claims per employee per month.” Ms. Love added “There was a 3.7% increase.” Commissioner Satterfield continued “The total premium for last year, ’10-’11 was \$1.3 million is that correct? Am I reading that correct? On page 3 under Plan Experience?” Ms. Love responded “The last 12 months was \$1.475 million. As a result when we received this renewal we sent it out for bids. CIGNA still had the best rate by far.” Commissioner Satterfield asked “So the premium for the previous year was what?” Mr. Howard responded “’10-’11 was \$1,345,011.70.” Commissioner Satterfield stated “That is what I thought. So it went up about \$65,000 or so from the previous year and we are looking at it going up \$65,000 more this year, is that right?” Ms. Love responded “A little bit more than that. It is \$1,475,000 right now so that will be \$17.60 per employee per month more.”

Commissioner Lucas asked “Just for clarification for me, the projection for the upcoming year is \$1,554,000, is that what you are saying?” Ms. Love responded “Yes.”

Chairman Hall asked “How soon do we need to take action on this Ms. Love?” Ms. Love responded “As soon as possible, if you decide to go with the HSA. We know that we will not have a huge participation the first year. The cost per employee will be \$516 in lieu of \$495. The rate would go down for each employee if they participated in the HSA to \$416. Most people are afraid of not having a co-pay so they don’t participate the first year. After they hear from other employees they tend to participate in the following years. We don’t know how many would participate in the HSA but based on past experience only about 10 participate the first year.” Chairman Hall continued “In the analysis, do you know what caused the spike in the plan?” Ms. Love responded “I can get that information. I am not sure if it was one claim or a lot of claims.”

Commissioner Lucas stated "I was just under the impression that we were going to try some sort of educational program early on about the HSA for the employees but maybe I just misunderstood." Ms. Love responded "We were going to do that but when we got all the claims data in January we thought it would be best to delay the HSA option." Commissioner Lucas continued "How many employees do we have currently? I don't mean on the plan. I just want the number of county employees because I know some have opted to go outside the county for insurance." Mr. Howard responded "Roughly 200 full time employees. Last year, when the family coverage went up, a lot of people left. We have 4 with employee/spouse, 8 with employee/child and 1 with employee/family."

Chairman Hall asked "For the most part we are just covering the employee." Ms. Love responded "Yes." Chairman Hall continued "Let me re-ask my earlier question, do we need to take action tonight?" Mr. Howard responded "We can probably wait until the first meeting in May." Chairman Hall asked "If we wait what will change?" Mr. Howard responded "Nothing is going to change. Ms. Love added "This is the renewal. If you still want to offer the HSA we can get started on that." Chairman Hall continued "So for HSA, just for clarification, based on the change in the claims we are looking at an addition how much per person increase opposed to what we are paying now?" Ms. Love responded "With the PPO only it is about \$17.60 per employee more. If we add the HSA, the PPO will be \$28.27 per employee more but the HSA will decrease by \$50.00 per employee per month. The problem is trying to get people to do the HSA. We estimate about 10 people the first year. The county would contribute \$750.00 per employee. There would be a lower premium for the HSA. If you have 20% of the employees to sign up you would save money. That is the reason we recommended to wait on the HSA for another year."

Commissioner Satterfield asked "If you can take just a moment and explain to me the last line, well both of the lines in Option 1. I understand what you are talking about on renewal, that is the column you have marked renewal on this report, is that correct and that is the same thing we currently have this year?" Ms. Love responded "The column listed as Current is what you have right now. The column listed as Renewal is subject to the PPO renewal. We have adjusted that amount based on the figures up to date. Then where it says Option 1 the first column is for the PPO and the other is for the HSA." Commissioner Satterfield continued "So if they enroll in the HSA it drops down to \$418 per month?" Ms. Love responded "Yes." Commissioner Satterfield asked "And they also have a co-insurance that drops from \$6,000 to \$4,000 family max." Ms. Love responded "Employees have a hard time with the HSA to begin with. Hardly anyone signs up the first year. Unless they understand it they want sign up for it. I came to a Department Head meeting a couple of months ago and explained how the claims worked and I gave several scenarios. Usually we just don't get good participation the first year. Orange County started it this year and they had a lot of employees sign up for it but they asked for the HSA plan."

Chairman Hall stated "I was trying to simplify the numbers in my head. If we have 200 employees and offer the HSA and we have 5 employees to sign up those 5 employees will see a benefit. However with the other 195 employees we will be paying more for the package. Is that correct?" Ms. Love responded "Not only will you be paying more but everyone else will be paying more."

Commissioner Jefferies asked “Has this been explained to the employees that they are going to get a \$17.60 rate increase?” Chairman Hall responded “Let me clarify your question. The increase in the PPO policy for this year is \$17.60 for employees only. So Mr. Jefferies question is are the employees aware this increase is coming?” Mr. Howard responded “That is something that the county would pick up. I think Mr. Jefferies was thinking that this was going to be passed on to the employees and that is not the plan at this time.”

Chairman Hall stated “That is what I wanted to get clear on. How much do the county employees pay now?” Mr. Howard responded “Nothing.” Chairman Hall continued “That is what I thought. So the additional charge of \$17.60 per employee will come out of our pocket. If there is going to be an increase it will come out of the county’s budget unless that is changed. We can determine that later.”

Ms. Love stated “Last year when the employees dropped the dependent coverage they lost their medical exams for vision care. This year we have included that as an option under the vision care. You can get the comprehensive plan which includes the exam as well as the hardware or just the hardware only. The dental coverage is the same as it was before.”

Chairman Hall asked “That is strictly optional?” Ms. Love responded “Yes that is optional.” Chairman Hall continued “What percentage of participation do we have in these?” Ms. Vaughn responded “A large percentage.”

Commissioner Carter asked “How much does the dental pay as far as coverage? Most of the dental plans I have seen pay about 50 or 60%.” Mr. Howard responded “Ours actually builds up. I may not have the number exactly right but the first year it will pay for your exam and then 50% of the major dental work, the second year it will pay 75% and the third year it will pay 100% if you keep going to get your annual check-ups.” Commissioner Carter continued “So the employee cost of this would be \$27.94 per month?” Mr. Howard responded “That is correct. Dental and Eye Care is paid 100% by employees.”

Commissioner Williamson moved, seconded by Commissioner Carter to take the recommendation of Ms. Love and stay with the PPO plan and hopefully next year the plan will level off and we will be able to offer the HSA.

Commissioner Satterfield asked “Your recommendation was to not offer a HSA this current year or was your recommendation for ’12-’13?” Ms. Love responded “Our recommendation was for the next fiscal year. Hopefully next year there will not be a spike in medical claims.”

Upon a vote of the motion, the motion carried unanimously.

911 FUNDING APPROVAL

Mr. Vernon Massengill, 911 Board Chairman and Mr. Harvey Rudd, 911 Director came before the Board.

Mr. Massengill stated that he would like to give a quick synopsis. He stated that the 911 funds are allocated and collected by the state. 2 years ago there were several municipalities with extremely large fund balances. The reason for the large fund balances was because the range of spending was relatively narrow. Mr. Massengill stated that two years ago Representative Bill Faison was on the Public Utilities Commission and the two of them talked and he brought before the Public Utilities Commission about broadening the scope of expenditures. He stated that he and several others from different areas testified with the Utilities Commission. There was a meeting with Representative Faison and Richard Taylor, Chairman of the Utilities Commission. The legislation approved a 2 year moratorium and broadened the scope of what the money could be spent on. The 2 year moratorium runs out June 30th of this year at midnight. The 911 Board has met and they have determined what they could spend the money on. Mr. Massengill came before the Board to get an approval from them on what the 911 Board has approved to spend the money on and what the State 911 Board has approved. There was a list of things that this money could be spent on. After June 30th the money will revert back to the narrow range of spending.

Mr. Harvey Rudd stated after a lot of studying the board looked at the benefits of the emergency services in Caswell County. He stated there were several things that were a priority. One thing was to have satellite receivers in different parts of the county. Another thing they talked about was having MDIS systems in vehicles of the responders. With this system they would have the ability to talk back and forth between each other. 911 would be able to see where the vehicles are at any given time. If someone were to get in trouble they could be located by this system. They also talked about giving the fire departments computer and radio assistance. They also talked about upgrading the Communication Center. The last time anything was done was in 1992. The board talked about having an Emergency Operations Center where all the heads could gather and also have a classroom. The building needs to be renovated. They talked about getting a new security and entry system. This way they would be able to monitor when someone enters and exits the building.

Mr. Massengill stated that the 911 Board had met and approved this list.

Chairman Hall asked "I think it would be good if you would expound on the building renovation part and how you propose to handle that by June 30th?" Mr. Massengill responded "Gwen has been in contact with the state 911 and has gotten approval on the renovation. We can take the money for the renovation and pay for an ambulance or for patrol cars and then you hold the monies in a contingency fund until it is time to renovate that building and then it can be paid for out of those monies. That money will be used only to renovate the 911 Center. If you give the okay we can have everything else spent by June 30th with the exception of the renovation."

Commissioner Lucas asked "There is one item on here, the Carolina Recording System which is under the Current Capital Outlay Expenditures, what was that for?" Mr. Rudd responded "The new recording system. That is already in operation." Commissioner Lucas continued "You are just showing that for information purposes on here because that is already in place. I am coming up with a \$12,000 difference somehow." Mr. Massengill responded "These figures that we are playing with right now were figures we had as of December 31st. There will be more monies put in there from December 31st through June 30th and as we discussed with Mr. Hall and I discussed it with Mr. Satterfield we would like to match the buildings down there. We will not know how

much money we will have until then.” Commissioner Lucas asked “Can we just get some clarification on the telecommunication implementation cost of \$151,041.85, is that the capital outlay part? Under the first part where you have the Public Safety needs.” Mr. Howard responded “That is the 911 Center upgrade.” Ms. Vaughn stated that this was part of the annual report that has to be reported to the state 911. She added that \$363,000 would be expended out of this amount. The telecommunications cost is the 911 salaries and their benefits. Ms. Vaughn stated that she had talked with the State 911 on Friday and asked if the new items that the 911 Board had discussed would be allowed. The state board wanted to know the actual amount that would be spent.

Chairman Hall stated “So you have the planning under the fund balance report and then the actual request under the pending BOC approval?” Ms. Vaughn responded yes.

Commissioner Lucas stated “To me I am just seeing a difference in what is being planned for, the \$363,557.85 and maybe I am just not getting it here but your total expenditure you are planning to do here is \$432,083.” Chairman Hall responded “The plan was to spend 50% of the fund balance. This four thirty-two will change based on what the fund balance will be at the end of the fiscal year.” Commissioner Lucas continued “My other question is a possible extension on June 30th date is it being discussed that they may do that?” Mr. Massengill responded “No.”

Mr. Ferrell stated “Mr. Massengill I have not looked to the legislation that you talked about as far as broadening the scope of the expenditures. I understood you to say that Items 1 through 4 including the upgrades are all included in the expanded definition of what the 911 can spend these funds for but that there is some accounting that needs to be done because the expenditure of the upgrades of the center will not take place before the expiration of the expanded line items, if you will, will be spent. I also understood you to say that the finance director had gotten approval from the state to engage in this accounting reimbursement and I would like to hear from the finance director if she got that approval from somebody at the state just so I am sure that...” Mr. Massengill responded “She said it.” Mr. Ferrell continued “Well I misunderstood. I thought the conversation on Friday was as to the salaries, that is what I understood. Is that it, we have gotten approval for this delayed payment and shifting of line items?” Mr. Vaughn responded “We can use the funding to pay for the 4 vehicles or the ambulance. The county will set aside \$110,000 in the capital fund and hold it for the renovation of the 911 center. It was approved to spend the money on one of these items.” Mr. Ferrell stated “I think I am getting it. I see it in the packet here but I am trying to get my arms around it.”

Chairman Hall stated “Let me put it another way. The purchase of the ambulance or the patrol cars is an allowed cost. This money will be put in the capital fund in order to meet this spending deadline. It is okay to pay for one of these items and then when the 911 wants to renovate their building the money will be in the capital fund.”

Commissioner Lucas asked “Why is there a distinction with just one item?” Mr. Massengill responded “These are the items that are on the approved list. It can be whatever you want it to be as long as it meets the total we need for the renovation.” Commissioner Lucas continued “Has the one hundred and one already been expended out for the ambulance?” Ms. Vaughn responded “Yes.” Mr. Ferrell stated “I think this is an accounting issue and not a legal issue so if

the finance director is okay I am okay. I was just trying to understand where the funds were. I think that is important but at the end of the day it sounds like it is an accounting issue. The finance director has talked with the state about it and is comfortable with it.” Commissioner Lucas asked “I understand the process very clearly but my other concern would be did we get our approval from the proper place with the state? Did you get this approved by the state treasurer since this is limited and has been already appropriated within our current budget?” Mr. Massengill responded “I can’t answer that question. We did get approval from the state 911 board.” Mr. Rudd added “I spoke with Richard Taylor on Friday and he suggested this. He is the chairman of the state 911 board. He said that this is what we needed to do.”

Commissioner Carter moved, seconded by Commissioner Jefferies to approve the 911 funding as presented by the 911 Board and by the 911 director.

Commissioner Lucas asked “What more do you need?” Mr. Massengill responded “Do you remember when we met and we were talking about upgrading the security and entrance system? That is one of the things. We also talked about bricking the whole building. There may not be any money left but if there is money leftover we would like to look at these other things as well. We don’t want a lot of this money to go back into these narrow categories.” Commissioner Travis added “What he is saying is if there is money leftover he is going to add it to these other projects they would like to do to the 911 center.” Mr. Massengill stated “We can come back if we have money leftover and ask for another motion.”

Upon a vote of the motion, the motion carried unanimously.

TOWN OF YANCEYVILLE STORMWATER EASEMENT REQUEST

Mr. Haynes Brigman, Town Manager, came before the Board and presented a deed of easement to install a storm water easement on county property near the detention center. Mr. Brigman provided a map of the storm water easement. This easement would provide a run off for storm water on the front of the property of the detention center. Mr. Brigman estimated that it would be a 90 day project. The work to install the storm water drain would not interfere with the detention center project.

Commissioner Lucas asked “What is the amount of the grant Haynes?” Mr. Brigman responded “\$373,294.” Commissioner Lucas continued “I know there is a focus on that particular block in there but this is for informational purposes, does the Town plan to do anything in any other areas like Wall Street or anywhere else for storm water issues?” Mr. Brigman responded that this is the only plan right now. He asked if there were any particular areas Commissioner Lucas was talking about.” Commissioner Lucas responded “There seems to be a lot of focus and I understand 86 South has it but the other part of town is in need as well for this.” Mr. Brigman stated that this plan would improve a two block area. Commissioner Lucas asked “Did you say it would cross over 86?” Mr. Brigman responded that there was already a 36” line there. This grant would be adding a 48” line. Commissioner Lucas continued “Is there a sewer line in that direction as well?” Mr. Brigman responded “No.” Commissioner Lucas stated “So there is no water or sewer line going in that direction.

Mr. Brigman stated that he had spoken with the county attorney before the meeting and he would like to have Mr. Ferrell to review the deed of easement and that he would welcome any comments or suggestions. Mr. Ferrell responded "Our conversation was essentially what you have before you is a fairly generic easement agreement. There may be some additional language that we would like to add especially in regards to the covenants of title, etc. I would like to have a chance to confirm with the Planning Department that what is shown on the map accurately shows the county's ownership and those types of things. That would not take a tremendous amount of time but the idea would be if this Board wanted to move forward that the approval would be to include the county attorney to make some amendments to the easement document prior to the chair's signature."

Commissioner Lucas asked "When you spoke about the Planning Department did you mean specifically to the Planner or are you planning to take it before the Planning Board?" Mr. Ferrell responded "No it is really just a land records check. That is what I am talking about. The idea would be just to make sure that the plat map that was used in preparation of the easement matches the way it plats on the ground. As to the county's ownership with the new construction there have been some new maps that have come on record fairly recently so it is just a matter of confirming the title and again taking a look at the standard form. I would probably want to draft my own easement document rather than using this form for utility projects such as this." Commissioner Lucas continued "So the total square footage of the project would be 10,265 square feet?" Mr. Brigman responded that he was not sure of the square footage. He added that they would be working on the 86 side of the property and there would not be any issues with the construction going on. The property would be put back in the same condition it was before the storm drain is put in.

Chairman Hall stated "Counsel has suggested that if we take action that we allow him the opportunity to verify our ownership and then to make some minor changes to the standard form and then discuss it with their legal counsel." Mr. Ferrell responded "That is certainly correct. I can put a draft together quickly and make sure that everyone has a chance to review it before it is presented to the chair for his signature."

Commissioner Carter moved, seconded by Commissioner Williamson to approve the deed of easement of the storm drain as presented by the town manager with the county attorney making the necessary adjustments to the easement and checking on the land ownership. The motion carried unanimously.

RECESS

The Board held a brief recess.

SECTION 8 HOUSING AUTHORITY'S FINANCIAL REQUEST FOR COUNTY ASSISTANCE

Ms. Angy Turner, Section 8 Director came before the Board to ask for the Commissioners help. HUD is cutting some of the Section 8 Housing funds. Ms. Turner informed the Board that the administrative monies were in the negative. She asked that the county consider cutting the

monthly charge to Section 8. Ms. Turner stated that the monthly charged had more than doubled over the last 15 years. She added that there were 3 options: 1) ask the county commissioners to waive the indirect fees, 2) shut the office down or 3) have another county take over the office. Ms. Turner stated that she had called several other small counties and they did not have to pay such a high indirect fee to the county. If the county decides to not support this request 600 people would be put out in the street. She also added that she had 132 landlords that would be losing their incomes as well. Ms. Turner asked the commissioners to not take this away from the clients and their children.

Commissioner Satterfield asked "Your current budget is the top figure \$1.1 million is that correct?" Ms. Turner responded "Yes." Commissioner Satterfield continued "And you anticipate getting \$1,060,000 this coming year?" Ms. Turner responded "Yes." Commissioner Satterfield asked "Don't all federal agencies pay an indirect cost, don't they, Mr. Manager?" Mr. Howard responded "The indirect costs we charge those to the enterprise funds. They are self supporting. We charge back to them to recoup the cost for my time, Gwen's time or any other county department they pull off of. That is figured out by a company that comes in and does a cost allocation study. We base in on the figures they put together." Commissioner Satterfield continued "Don't the agencies next door pay an indirect cost?" Mr. Howard responded "No sir." Commissioner Satterfield asked "Who pays indirect cost?" Mr. Howard responded "The landfill, CATS and Section 8."

Commissioner Carter asked "How much are you requesting for the county to fund?" Ms. Turner responded "We are \$18,000 in the red. I would like to have this fiscal year's indirect cost returned."

Chairman Hall asked "How much was the indirect cost for this year?" Ms. Turner responded "\$53,736. HUD's representative came down to meet with Mr. Howard. This is the best way we can get back on our feet. It is a wonderful program and I would hate for the county to lose it."

Commissioner Satterfield asked "Ms. Turner the \$18,661 that you are short so far this year that is so far this year right?" Ms. Turner responded "Yes sir." Commissioner Satterfield continued "Do you anticipate that growing between now and June 30th?" Ms. Turner responded "Yes sir." Commissioner Satterfield asked "So where is the money coming from to pay that?" Chairman Hall responded "I think that is the point." Commissioner Satterfield continued "Well between this year's budget and next year's budget there is about fifty some thousand dollars in short fall. Are you talking about cutting the indirect cost for this year, the current year, as well as next year?" Ms. Turner responded "Yes sir. The ideal plan is to get back what we need to be back in line. This has nothing to do with mismanagement. All we are asking for is the indirect monies back." Commissioner Satterfield asked "Are you talking about refunding to your agency the entire amount for this year or a portion of that amount?" Ms. Turner responded "I am requesting all of it so we can get back in line with our budget and to bring us of the negative."

Mr. Howard stated "One thing that affects the admin funding is the number of rentals we have out. They are driving that number down as well, not to a huge extent. When they drive this down it drives down the admin as well. Admin is based on the number of houses you have or the number of houses you have in the program. Since they are driving down costs on both sides,

what was the reduction from last year to this year, the number of folks you have in the program?" Ms. Turner responded "We had 267 families but now we have 255." Mr. Howard stated "That reduces the admin money to some extent but not a lot."

Commissioner Satterfield stated "I know at one time Section 8 had a fairly sizeable fund balance that could be used that is not restricted. Obviously it has diminished over the years. It is because they have been taking money from that fund balance to continue the operations instead of scaling back or what? What happened to it, do you have any idea?" Ms. Turner responded "The per unit cost has gotten higher and we are having to pay more." Commissioner Satterfield continued "So there is a portion of the unappropriated and unrestricted fund balance in prior years been allocated to balance the budget?" Chairman Hall responded "I think we need to be clear. The money used to pay rent is separate and apart from the state money. She mentioned a little bit about the units. The dollars for that have been reduced somewhat but it is not enough to account for all of what they have done. What they have done is they looked across the board at all the Section 8 agencies and they have this money in fund balance and they are forcing them to use it. Our Section 8 because there are so few people and it is so small the agency does not care if they have enough people to run that program there. They just keep taking more and more. In a sense some of it is not related."

Mr. Howard stated "If you will remember about a year ago, the previous director came before the Board about the federal government reducing the HAP applications as well forcing us to spend the fund balance. They told us to use the fund balance to pay the rent. We had to split the fund balance into two categories: admin cost and the HAP cost. They wanted to see how much the county had in each one to force you to spend down the HAP money. You can spend admin on HAP but you can't spend HAP on admin, if that makes any sense."

Commissioner Satterfield asked "So my question is have we been using some of the federal funds that were in a fund balance to help defer some of these expense in the budget, whether it be housing or whether it be admin?" Mr. Howard responded "Yes at the direction of the federal government." Commissioner Satterfield continued "And now that has run out?" Mr. Howard responded "Yes sir." Commissioner Satterfield stated "So the only thing we have left is the restricted fund balance." Mr. Howard responded "The only funds left are the HAP." Commissioner Satterfield continued "So what are we going to have to do in the future? Are we going to have to reduce the number of houses or what?" Ms. Turner responded "We are already doing that. When families come off they are not being put back in the system."

Commissioner Travis stated "What she is saying is the money they are paying us they need it for operations." Ms. Turner responded "Yes sir." Commissioner Travis asked "Kevin, where will we get the money to reimburse this?" Mr. Howard responded "Our budget right now our revenues are ahead of expenditures. We are looking at about a \$400,000 difference in those two as of March 30th. Our sales taxes are coming in above what we projected in this year's budget. We brought in some back fees for the cell towers in the county. That is about \$30,000 in the budget." Commissioner Travis stated "Well the only thing we can do is address this year." Mr. Howard responded "That is correct." Commissioner Travis continued "And next year's indirect cost will need to be addressed in next year's budget." Mr. Howard responded "Yes sir."

Commissioner Jefferies asked “County manager what is your recommendation?” Mr. Howard responded “The only option we have right now is to waive the fee for this fiscal year and we will plan for next year in the budget process.”

Commissioner Satterfield moved, seconded by Commissioner Jefferies to grant the financial request for Section 8 Housing to refund the indirect cost for the current fiscal year. The motion carried unanimously.

REQUEST FROM SHERIFF’S OFFICE ABOUT CHERRY GROVE ROAD

Mr. Howard stated “I had a request from Sheriff Welch. He has had some complaints about the area on Cherry Grove Road where we put in a new landfill convenience site. He has requested the Board to petition the NCDOT to change the speed limit to 45 mph from the current speed limit.”

Commissioner Travis stated “I agree the speed limit needs changing. I mentioned this when this was first mentioned. The 45 mph needs to start at Turner Road and go all the way past the fire department. There is a bus that stops in the curve and you can’t see it because the trees are hanging over the road. The DOT should go over there and cut all those trees down. There at least should be some signs over there that say ‘Caution, Convenience Center Ahead’.”

Chairman Hall stated “I recall when we made that decision and I recall Mr. Travis bringing up a couple of other issues. I also recall us saying let’s take the time to make sure it is the best location but someone said we had to do it right away. I know from a practical standpoint Cherry Grove Road is highly used in Caswell for people going to work and we need to recognize that.”

Commissioner Williamson stated “I agree we need to reduce the speed limit. I know it is also a narrow road and there are lots of logging trucks and things running up and down the highway. Actually it should go all the way up to the other 45 mph zone which is above the Camp Springs area. So in order words it should be from the beginning of Cherry Grove Road all the way down to Turner Road. I know that will impact the commuters but we have to give ourselves time to make that travel.”

Commissioner Lucas stated “Mr. Travis brought it up about the trees. Is that an issue?” Commissioner Travis responded “Yes, you cannot see the lights on the school bus until you are in the curve.” Commissioner Lucas continued “The reason I am bringing that up is because I have had several people contact me about issues with trees over other roads in the county. When I called DOT to talk to them about what their process was to take care of it, they said they contract that out and until they get enough trees on the list they don’t really do anything. I am wondering how many trees they have to have and how long does it take. We might be able to speed that process up.” Chairman Hall responded “Unless it interferes with the utilities the DOT will not do anything. We can find the answer. Before we propose cutting down someone’s trees we need to have a public hearing to hear from the citizens.” Commissioner Lucas stated “I was not suggesting that we cut down someone’s trees that does not want them cut down but my point was people contacted me and were asking for help. They thought it was a hindrance or a danger in the highway. The DOT would do the work but they have to have a certain amount before they

will do it. They have a contractor to come in to handle it. I don't advocate cutting down trees at all."

Commissioner Travis moved, seconded by Commissioner Williamson to approve the Sheriff's request to petition the NCDOT to reduce the speed on Cherry Grove Road.

Commissioner Lucas asked "Do we have to hold a public hearing?" Chairman Hall responded "We have to do this first."

Upon a vote of the motion, the motion carried unanimously.

VEHICLE USE POLICY

Chairman Hall stated "You received this in your previous packet so you have had the chance to read it twice. This is the Vehicle Use Policy as proposed by the County Manager."

Commissioner Satterfield stated "I noticed in reading this thing Mr. Manager and I was somewhat surprised this has been on the table evidently since June of 2006." Mr. Howard responded "No sir that is an old date from the one I look at and I did not update that. This has never been discussed before." Commissioner Satterfield continued "Fuel conservation plan, this is a great idea. Have the department heads been briefed on this and has anyone presented a plan to you regarding fuel conservation?" Mr. Howard responded "Not at the moment, no sir. There is no requirement to do so at this time." Commissioner Satterfield asked "Have they been talked to about this plan at all?" Mr. Howard responded "No sir." Commissioner Satterfield continued "So they don't know anything about it. Another thing is this post accident substance abuse test. It says if they are in an accident they may or will be considered for testing. Someone is going to have to make a judgment call on whether or not they are going to test someone if they are involved in an accident." Mr. Howard responded "Correct." Commissioner Satterfield stated "I don't particularly like that because if you are the guy who is going to make the call it might be your good friend or an employee you know very well and you say you know I am not going to test you. I think the testing needs to be done if there is an accident if it involves an injury or property damage. You either do it or you don't do it. Will be considered for testing, I don't particular like that."

Commissioner Jefferies stated "Everyone should be tested."

Commissioner Travis stated "I thought that whenever anyone had an accident they were automatically tested." Mr. Howard responded "The CDOT drivers, if you have a CDL license you are required to be tested." Chairman Hall asked "Not everybody?" Mr. Howard responded "No sir not everybody." Commissioner Travis continued "Let say a deputy wrecks a car they don't have to be tested?" Mr. Howard responded "They may be but that depends on the Sheriff's department policy. I am not sure of their policy but what I am trying to do is to have a countywide policy for all departments."

Chairman Hall stated "When I made my notes Mr. Satterfield I suggested instead of considered saying subject to." Commissioner Satterfield responded "I think we need to change it to will be

tested and not even subject to. It kind of broadens that just a little bit.” Mr. Howard responded “The idea of putting it that way was if you have something that you can give some leeway, if it is a minor accident and you know no one was using drugs we should not require testing and spend the money for no reason.” Commissioner Travis stated “I understand what Mr. Satterfield is talking about. Let’s say one of our employees pulls out of this parking lot and backs into a vehicle he should not be tested. I am talking about a wreck or something like that.” Chairman Hall asked “Why not?” Commissioner Travis responded “Well I mean what is it going to cost to test everyone for something like that?” Mr. Howard responded “I think it is around \$50 but I am not positive.” Chairman Hall stated “What this would do is send a message stating that every time you get into a vehicle you are held accountable and you need to pay close attention.”

Commissioner Carter asked “I agree with you when you say someone gets injured or it damages someone’s property but and Caswell County is bad from November through February about hitting deer, are you going to test somebody that hits a deer? The testing is about \$110.”

Chairman Hall responded “That is a good point. Maybe some wording needs to be put in the policy that lays that out.” Mr. Howard stated “May need to say that if the employee appears to be at fault he or she will be tested.” Chairman Hall responded “That is subjective. I passed a county vehicle once on 86 pulled over, almost in the ditch but not turned over. My understanding was they pulled over on the shoulder of the road and it was too soft that it gave away. My first thought was what were they thinking you don’t do stuff like that. I think that we as a Board need to do things that are practical.” Commissioner Travis asked “So what you are saying is it is still going to be someone’s call?” Chairman Hall responded “Yes but let’s say someone hits a deer for the 3rd time in one month, we may need to have a look at that.

Commissioner Satterfield stated “You can put something in that policy whether or not they are at fault. If someone runs into an ambulance or a deputy then they are not at fault. I would not think we would test them for something like that.” Commissioner Travis responded “If we say we are going to test every accident, yes we will.” Commissioner Satterfield continued “That is why I said we may have to put something in here. Why test someone for an accident that is not their fault.”

Chairman Hall stated “I have a list of things but I wanted to hear everyone’s thoughts before I begin. The policy does not address how we handle DWIs, passing a stopped school bus and other things like that. What are the ramifications? In other words, if I get a DWI and I am still driving our policy does not address that.” Commissioner Travis responded “You would not be driving if you got a DWI.” Chairman Hall continued “Well let’s say I get a ticket for careless and reckless driving.” Commissioner Lucas responded “That is addressed under the driver requirements and responsibilities. It says that each driver of a county vehicle must have a valid license. Should an employee driving a county owned vehicle be involved in a vehicle incidence on or off the job or their license is suspended or revoked the employee is obligated to inform their department head within 24 hours. Failure to inform the county of a suspended or revoked license results in immediate dismissal. Do want it to say specific things?” Chairman Hall responded “It does not address those who have not been charged.” Commissioner Williamson asked “But is that not one of the requirements of being able to drive one of the county vehicles is to have a valid driver’s license?” Chairman Hall responded “Yes but let’s say you got the ticket tonight but your license may not be revoked until you go to court.” Commissioner Lucas asked

“But is that not where the county manager would make a case by case decision?” Mr. Howard responded “Well we could put some kind of language in there to say where every 6 months they provide a driving record versus yearly. Most places require a copy of their driver’s license and driving record every year, we can do that more frequently if the Board wishes to do that.”

Commissioner Williamson stated “It goes back to where a county employee is able to drive a county vehicle he or she has to have a valid driver’s license. I mean we all are subject to that. Just like my personal job if I fail to report and they find out it is an automatic dismissal. That covers a lot of the ‘ifs’ and ‘ands’ of whether I have a driver’s license or not. Even if I get a ticket I have to report it. It does not matter. I think if you put that part in there you don’t have to worry about every little thing. There are many things you can put in there that is subject to questions but having to have a valid driver’s license and reporting any incidents to your manager or supervisor covers that part.”

Chairman Hall stated “The other thing I noticed that was not addressed was the transporting of children.” Commissioner Lucas stated “I did not think children were supposed to be in county vehicles.” Mr. Howard responded “It addresses non-county employees being in the vehicles. The children would be the one with the Recreation. Family Services and DSS, both, transport children in their vehicles. This may be where they are transporting children from one foster home to another. Most of the time this happens in their person vehicles because we do not have a fleet for Social Services.” Commissioner Carter asked “But they are not supposed to carry their children to school right?” Chairman Hall stated “The distinction still needs to be noted whether personal vehicle or county vehicle, anything could happen. There are certain laws that have to be followed.” Commissioner Carter asked again “What about kids being taken to school?” Chairman Hall responded “That is a separate issue and we have not gotten to that part yet.” Mr. Howard responded “So you want it to be more specific such as they need to examine seatbelts laws, child restraint laws, do a general example of those things.”

Chairman Hall stated “One of the other things I notice in the policy that if there is an accident Emergency Management will investigate. Why would we have EMS to inspect this?” Commissioner Lucas responded “Emergency Management.” Mr. Howard added “In other counties Emergency Management is also a safety person is held at a higher level and they investigate these.” Chairman Hall stated “I think this should be handled at a higher level.”

Chairman Hall stated “Another issue is the vehicle maintenance is the responsibility of the employee. I can see where they would be responsible for inspections and to kick the tires but not to do the maintenance.” Mr. Howard responded “The intent of that is making sure that the vehicle is being maintained. They are getting the oil changes done. In the cases of where they have a vehicle that they take home they are responsible for the maintenance of that vehicle. If not that privilege is taken away.” Chairman Hall continued “The problem with that to me is that you have someone that is responsible for something that is out of the realm of their expertise. Vehicle maintenance should be held at a higher level. Someone should be required to monitor those on maintenance logs.” Commissioner Travis responded “People driving vehicles on a daily basis should know when the oil needs to be changed. Unless you have a person at the sheriff’s office to check the mileage on all the vehicles it is almost impossible to keep up with it. It needs to be the responsibility of the driver.” Mr. Howard added “It is ultimately the

department head's responsibility to make sure the vehicles are taken care of." Chairman Hall stated "I understand that but we bought 2 ambulance engines last year. We are talking about big money and we have to have someone who is going to be responsible." Commissioner Satterfield responded "But Mr. Chairman this plan states that a place like EMS, they are not assigned a particular vehicle down there. That is a department function down there. The sheriff's office is different because they are assigned a particular vehicle. If that person driving that car does not have sense enough to realize when the vehicle needs servicing then they need to be gotten rid of. Who check your car, you said you are not a mechanic, who checks your car to tell you when you need oil or not?" Chairman Hall responded "Mr. Travis does." Commissioner Satterfield continued "But you have someone to check it right?" Chairman Hall stated "Here's my point, we can make a statement that they should have enough sense to know what to do but that is not the point. Say you come on the shift at 7:00 in the morning and you run all day and you come off the shift at some point someone is going to miss something that is why we bought those two engines. I don't hold anything person against the staff. I know that someone should have checked it; a system should have been in place. If everybody is responsible then nobody is responsible or vice versa." Commissioner Satterfield stated "I guess the plan that EMS came up with addresses that. I hope." Commissioner Williamson responded "Yes they have a new policy and new EMS director sent me a copy of it." Chairman Hall stated "I understand that but we are talking about a countywide policy for all vehicles. I don't want to pick on EMS. We have other vehicles out there and we have other departments."

Chairman Hall stated "Another thing that was said was all alterations must be approved by department heads. I don't think department heads should have this authority." Mr. Howard responded "That would be that each department head would have to approve any changes as in vehicles requirements such as safety lights. That would be if you had utility trucks." Chairman Hall stated "These are county vehicles. The policy should be specific."

Commissioner Lucas asked "Should we require that all county vehicles be identified?" Mr. Howard responded "They all do now. I take that back we have one that is not and that will be rectified shortly." Commissioner Lucas continued "What about all the sheriff's vehicles?" Mr. Howard responded "Except the unmarked vehicles they all have sheriff's logos on them."

Chairman Hall stated "One other things I notices was that the policy did not address family members being in the vehicles." Commissioner Satterfield responded "It says under assigned vehicles due to insurance limitations and regulations passengers are prohibited unless authorized by the county manager." Chairman Hall asked "How many assigned vehicles do you have in this county?" Mr. Howard responded "Outside of the sheriff's office there are 6." Chairman Hall continued "How many county vehicles?" Mr. Howard responded "Counting CDOT, EMS, Recreation, probably 25 or 30 and that does not include public safety. The sheriff's office would follow the sheriff's policy." Chairman Hall stated "These are county vehicles. The county is paying for the insurance." Mr. Howard responded "Under insurance reflects that family members are not allowed to be in the vehicle. Under our policy it says unless they have a bonafided reason for being in the vehicle they are not supposed to be in the vehicle and that would include family members." Chairman Hall stated "That is too subjective for me." It needs to be spelled out. I think this should be across the board including the sheriff's office."

Commissioner Lucas asked "What is they both are county employees but from different departments in one county vehicle?" Mr. Howard responded "I think that would fall back upon the reason for the two of them in the same vehicle. It could be for training. It is going to be hard to get this as specific as we would like for it to be and still be manageable that is why some things are left up to some subjectivity." Chairman Hall responded "The things I mentioned should not be that hard to get into the policy. That is the end of my notes and observations does anyone else have anything that you would like for the county manager to consider?"

Commissioner Carter stated "I think that each commissioner needs to study this between now and the next meeting and get out notes together. We have been on this one thing for 30 minutes." Chairman Hall responded "Policies take time." Commissioner Williamson stated "I think this should be discussed with the department heads to get more input on it." Commissioner Jefferies responded "That is a good idea. They may have some input themselves. They may see things that need to be added." Chairman Hall stated "I don't have a problem with that. We will take this tonight as just information and suggest that this is reviewed with the department heads not only for the policy position but in case there may be some variances that need to be added to the policy."

CASWELL COUNTY PARK TENNIS COURTS UPDATE

Mr. Howard stated "You have a memo in your packets and a couple of quotes. We have been waiting 4 to 6 months for it to dry out and it has not dried out. We have an idea on what the problem is. I had Martin & Loftis, who did the site work for the jail, agreed to so over to do a test to see how deep it was and to see what the soil consisted of. The soil is not the issue apparently the soil was not compacted when it was originally put in. I have been asking around and nobody knows. They only say it has been 25 or 30 years since it was done. What our problem is the equipment is too heavy to run over this soil to put the asphalt down. That is why it needs to be replaced. There is a concern with the soil. It tends to draw moisture to it and they are concerned there may be a spring or something underneath it. When the soil comes out and they determine it is a spring under there they can put in a French drain to drain the water out. They don't think there is one there but they wanted to mention it just in case it is there. I guess my question is do you want to spend money now to correct the problem or wait until this summer to see if it dries out. The problem will be if we wait we will still have to remove the soil to replace the tennis courts and then timing if we wait until summer it will not be available to the tennis team for this fall."

Commissioner Travis asked "Are you sure there is no water leak?" Mr. Howard responded "There are no water lines going through that area." Commissioner Lucas asked "How do we know for sure?" Mr. Howard responded "We don't know for sure without digging a hole right there." Commissioner Lucas continued "Because it is my understanding that the Town does not have maps to show where water lines are." Commissioner Travis stated "It is hard for me to believe that the soil has not dried out." Mr. Howard responded "The problem is that the soil around it was compacted but that section is not so it acts as a sponge. When it rains that area soaks the water in and it does not run off. This is in the back corner." Commissioner Travis continued "You have the other courts done." Mr. Howard responded "We have not done any of it. You said to wait and do it all at one time."

Commissioner Lucas asked "Why is this soil issue become such a big issue all of a sudden? Won't you on the Board when the tennis courts were initially constructed? They were there for how many years without a water issue?" Commissioner Satterfield responded "I wasn't. There have always been problems down there; I know that, ever since it was built. The commissioners spent money several times down there but they have always had problems down there." Commissioner Lucas continued "What are we talking about in cost here?" Mr. Howard responded "It depends on how far the Board wants to go. It could be between \$15,000 and \$20,000." Commissioner Lucas asked "So it is \$20,000 to remove the soil and \$15,000 to replace it?" Mr. Howard responded "No ma'am. If they get into it and they install a French drain it will run about \$20,000. If they go in and replace the soil and that works it will be about \$15,000."

Commissioner Satterfield asked "Mr. Manager this \$26,100 is that to do the same thing that Martin & Loftis is talking about as far as putting French drains in?" Mr. Howard responded "No sir. The \$26,000 is to go in and do a bridge. Martin & Loftis is saying to go in and remove all of the soil that is there and replace the soil." Commissioner Satterfield continued "Who is the quote for \$26,100 from?" Mr. Howard responded "Court One. He is the one who is installing the tennis courts." Commissioner Satterfield asked "Is that the company who is doing the tennis courts?" Mr. Howard responded "Yes sir." Commissioner Satterfield continued "I don't like the idea of two different people this and the reason being is if you spend \$20,000 with Martin & Loftis and you have a problem down there is a year or two the first thing they are going to say is Martin Loftis did not do the job right." Mr. Howard responded "I understand that. My recommendation was to have someone else to come in and tell me us what they thought. They recommendation was to take the soil out. I was going to get with Court One to see if they were okay to do what Martin & Loftis recommended if the Board wants to move forward now." Commissioner Satterfield stated "I think we need to move forward on this. Now is the time to do this job if you are going to do it." Mr. Howard responded "Yes sir."

Chairman Hall asked "Does Court One have an engineer?" Mr. Howard responded "They had their site worker to come out and assess the project. They did not have an engineer to look at it." Chairman Hall continued "Like Mr. Satterfield stated they have had problems since day one and part of that may mean that we may have to move the project." Commissioner Lucas responded "Or it very well could be a water issue." Commissioner Satterfield stated "If you had a water line leak it would not be drying out at all." Commissioner Travis asked "Is it drying out?" Mr. Howard responded "It is drying out some. They area is small now than what it was."

Commissioner Travis stated "Whoever compacts it needs to be the same company. I agree with what Gordon said. You don't need to have 2 or 3 people involved because they will blame the other person."

Mr. Ferrell stated "I will point out to you in the note section of the Court One proposal for either of the two options; in their note section it says 'we hope to bridge this with either of the options above however there is no guarantee that this will fix the problem.' So you are not getting a guarantee from Court One that they are going to be able to solve it. They are just telling you two things they can try to help to fix it so if we are going to look to Court One solution as a failure

there is a disclaimer right here. There is not warranty of a fix here.” Chairman Hall responded “At some point we have to have professional willing to take responsibility for their work.”

Mr. Howard stated “I can have the soil technician that is with the jail project to look at it if you would like.”

Commissioner Lucas asked “Since Commissioner Carter’s expertise is in water can’t we have him to check the meter?” Chairman Hall responded “Anybody can do that.” Commissioner Lucas continued “My point is to have it checked.” Chairman Hall responded “We need to find out if there are other basic problems going on.” Commissioner Lucas stated “There could be an old water line there that nobody is aware of.” Chairman Hall stated “We can do that but if that is not the answer the question is where do we go from there. I don’t want our action to hinge on checking one thing.”

Commissioner Travis stated “We should not spend this money if we are not going to get a guarantee. If we can’t get a guarantee the best thing to do is to forget about the tennis courts. Here we are talking about spending more money to fix the tennis courts and we are talking about cutting funds.” Chairman Hall responded “I hope you don’t look at it that way. We need to look at the needs of the county. It is an investment. We have spent a ton of money on this project and we need to see it through to completion.”

Commissioner Lucas asked “Where did the concerns come from that there might be an underground water source?” Mr. Howard responded “If you look under Court One they mention maybe installing a drain to drain the area. The concern was if you dig it all up there may be a water source down there. That is something that can be corrected with a French drain.”

Chairman Hall stated “We may need to alter the project. We need a professional to look at it. Mr. Rick McVey stated “Why don’t you get a soil engineer to look at it and determine at what depth this is happening. Have a professional to make the decision on what needs to be done.”

Commissioner Lucas asked “Isn’t that what you said to have someone to look at it?” Mr. Howard responded “Yes ma’am, SM&E.”

Commissioner Lucas moved, seconded by Commissioner Carter to delay action until a soil engineer can assess the soil, whether SM&E or some professional, can determine if it is suitable soil or an underground water source in the area. The motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Hall stated “Mr. Manager will come back before the Board on a cost estimate for doing this.” Commissioner Satterfield stated “I think he needs to get this back to the Board pretty quickly because of the weather.” Mr. Howard responded “I will have it tomorrow.”

Commissioner Lucas asked “The letter said they did do a test is that not correct?” Mr. Howard responded “That was not a soil engineer. To them there is not a problem with the soil, it is just not compacted.”

FRAUD, WASTE AND ABUSE HOTLINE

Chairman Hall stated "I think it was reported a month or so ago that the Hotline was up and running. I just wanted to report to you that it is working. We had a call to come in concerning the Sheriff's Department. We have referred that information to the Sheriff to handle it. Basically I just wanted to let you know that it is working. We want people to encourage people to use it at any time. I will not be specific but the caller suggested that someone in the sheriff's department withheld information that was a matter of public record and again this was referred to the sheriff for him to handle."

COUNTY MANAGER'S REPORT

Mr. Howard stated "I Just wanted to make the Board aware that some of the projects that were brought to you as a Capital Plan we are starting to address those. The stairwell next door was taken out over the weekend. We will be working on those projects for the next few weeks. The next project will be repairing the steps and ramp at Section 8 and Probation building."

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairman Hall stated "Please take note of the announcements and upcoming events."

- A. Murder in The Library drama – April 13th @ 7:00 p.m. and April 14th @ 6:00 p.m.
- B. County Day – April 21, 2012 – 10:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. @ Senior Center
- C. Public Records Law Webinar – April 24, 2012 from 1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
- D. Meeting with Town of Yanceyville, Town of Milton and Commissioners
April 24, 2012 at 6:00 p.m. – Town Hall
- E. Person-Caswell Lake Authority Cook Out – May 17, 2012
6:00 p.m. Social 7:00 p.m. Dinner
- F. NCACC County Assembly Day – May 30, 2012
- G. NACo Annual Conference in Pittsburgh – July 13-17, 2012
- H. NCACC Annual Conference at Raleigh Convention Center – August 16 – 19, 2012

Commissioner Williamson stated "I will be going to the Transportation meeting on Wednesday in Lexington. This is the committee I accepted to be on." Chairman Hall responded "Have you been briefed on what they are doing on the Square?" Commissioner Williamson responded "No I have not." Chairman Hall continued "Get with the County manager or county clerk and they can brief you on that. There is some work that is being done on the Square. They are going to pave it. The barrels are going to be removed and sign will be put up. We had a meeting with the public to get ideas. The DOT is going to fund this whole project. They are going to put brick pavers around the square. Look at the sidewalks. They are going to put in a crosswalk and they are going to change the island on the eastside but the county manager can fill you in."

Commissioner Jefferies stated "I will be going down on the 19th to a PBH orientation and I am also going to ask them to send a representative to come and talk with us so we can see where they stand and what they are going to do if that is alright with this Board."

Commissioner Lucas asked "I would like to ask about the Capital Fund. You talked about removing the steps over here, what was the cost to get that done?" Mr. Howard responded "\$1,100." Commissioner Lucas continued "Who did the work?" Mr. Howard responded "Colon Cassaday the county maintenance director brought in a welder to help cut it up. They took it down and hauled it off." Commissioner Lucas asked "And our balance in that fund is?" Mr. Howard responded "I can't tell you that off the top of my head. I will get that out to you. The original estimate was \$6,000 to have that done. We took that out of the Maintenance budget. That is not coming out of the capital fund. We decided to do some of these small projects as part of our maintenance budget."

Mr. Ferrell stated "I will speak briefly about the LME dissolution. You will hear more in the coming months of course about the progress of the dissolution. There is discussion right now about the timing of a public hearing the LME must hold as part of the dissolution process. There is a request that has been made from the Alamance County Attorney that a publication of the public meeting be made I think it was today. I am not sure where that request went. The LME's lawyer did not respond on email so I don't know if that request has been honored. At the end of the month there will be a public hearing in Alamance County on the dissolution if not this month it will be soon. That will be the next step in the process. Then again we were looking for some reports coming from the LME specifically an audit report containing a list of contingent liabilities and that sort of thing. So we are obviously not done. We are still moving forward and you will hear more about that process when I have some more concrete information."

Chairman Hall stated "You will notice in your agenda my appointment to the Roanoke River Basin Bi-State Commission. This has to do with water quality and water use; specifically we are concerned with the Dan River with the stakeholders upstream and downstream. We are talking about uranium mining and fracking and how it will impact us. The legislatures from both sides are involved in this. That is what this is about. I was appointed by the Governor because it was mentioned before that each county that is associated with the Dan River should have a representative. Everybody is involved. The issues in North Carolina have to deal with transporting water to the basins. These two commissions have to talk about that. We will talk about the impact in Caswell and Rockingham and the Jordan Lake rules. Agriculture is paying a cost. This is a big deal. I will try to keep you informed on what is going on."

ADJOURNMENT

At 9:10 p.m. Commissioner Jefferies moved, seconded by Commissioner Travis to adjourn. The motion carried unanimously.

Paula P. Seamster
Clerk to the Board

Nathaniel Hall
Chairman
